Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMPCP_85235**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Public Awareness, Perception and Attitude towards Organ Donation and Transplantation: Cross sectional study among Ha'il City community, Saudi Arabia.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Title of Manuscript: Not well written** **1. Should state the year of the study conducted** **Abstract: Not well written** **1. The background and objectives are too long, emphasize should be on the Method and Result section** **2. Method: What type of the study ?. Any sample size calculation done ?. or the investigators should justify the size of 406 participants.** **3. Result: Should also highlighted the findings of perception and attitude.** **4. Conclusion not very convincing as the last sentence is not part of the study findings** **INTRODUCTION:Not well written** **1. Too short and the author highlighted the Organ donation in the world (other countries). Followed by the prevalence of organ donation in the state.** **2. The second issues must be highlighted are the awareness, perception and altitude or organ donation (refer to your title).** **METHOD:not well written** **1. The method section is too weak and the author should include:** **i. Type of study** **ii. Time of the study done.** **iii. Ares of study conducted** **iv. Study respondents** **v. Instruments used** **vi. Data collection method** **vii. How the informed consent was obtained** **RESULTS: Not well written** **1. The authors should highlighted the important findings only. The table already self explainatory.** **2. Too many Table and Figure I can be included in Table II. While, Table IV can combine with Table III.** **DISCUSSION: Not well written** **1. This section should discuss the findings of the study and not repeated the findings from the results section.** **2. The authors should discuss the awareness, perception, altitude in seperate paragraph.** **3. Limitation should include in this section** **CONCLUSION RECOMMENDATION: Not well written** **1. Not very convincing and recommended not to include the findings data in this section** **2. Last sentence of recommendations is not a recommendation.** **REFERENCES:Not well written** **1. The reference must follow the index medicus style of reference writing. (refer on how to write abbrevation for journal)**	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This manuscript entitled " Awareness, Perception and Attitude towards Organ Donation and Transplantation: Cross sectional study among Ha'il City community, Saudi Arabia" was not very clear and well-conceived. Several problems were identified.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** ***(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)***
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Lim Kuang Kuay**
Department, University & Country	**Institute for Public Health, National Institutes of Health, Malaysia**